



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/881,673	06/18/2001	Tae-Young Kim	IK-0020	7194
34610	7590	05/19/2004	EXAMINER	
FLESHNER & KIM, LLP P.O. BOX 221200 CHANTILLY, VA 20153			FATAHI YAR, MAHMOUD	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2674	

DATE MAILED: 05/19/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/881,673

Applicant(s)

KIM ET AL.

Examiner

Mike Fatahiyar

Art Unit

2674

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 February 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 25 February 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-2, 7-8, 14-16, 19-24 and 26-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bridson(6,359,270) in view of Norwood(5,063,600).

Bridson disclose an apparatus module(12) for inputting and displaying data for a household appliance such as a microwave or a freezer(column 3, lines 24-48). The module(12) is attached to the outer surface of the appliance and it comprises a touchscreen(column 10, lines 49-65), a memory means(25,28) and a control means(29,36) for storing and controlling of input data on the touch screen. Bridson substantially shows all the features of the claim 1 except for the "touch screen being configured to receive image data written or drawn on the touchscreen by a user". However, Norwood is cited to show that the concept of utilizing a touch input information management system configured to receive image data written or drawn on a touchscreen by a user is old(see abstract and column 7, lines 10-40). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of Bridson with the above noted teaching of Norwood such that the touchscreen(20) of Bridson would also be able to receive image data written or drawn on it by a user because both references are related to data management for a touch input device.

In claims 2 and 16, relative to the limitation “storing information data related to stored items/foods in a refrigerator”, such information storage is considered to be an arbitrary design choice which would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art because the modified touchscreen(20) of Bridson is configured and capable of receiving any kind of hand written or drawn image data by a user and further because the touch pad module(12) of Bridson is attached to the front surface door of an appliance which functions as a family organizer, note pad or a notice board.

In claims 7-8 and 19-24, 26-30, relative to the limitations “schedule management function utilizing a calendar for reminding a user of a specific event on a particular date”, such is shown to be old by the calendar and scheduling feature of Norwood(column 16, lines 12-29; column 20, lines 10-61 and figure 16). Thus, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art to modify the system of Bridson with the noted teaching of Norwood such that when a schedule management function is touched a calendar is displayed for entering information on a specific date region so as to remind a user of a specific event because Bridson also shows the desirability for using a calendar and scheduling feature in his system(see column 22, lines 7-28).

3. Claims 3-6, 10-13 and 17-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bridson in view of Norwood and Omori(5,675,363).

Bridson and Norwood are discussed above. Omori is cited to show that the concept of utilizing a memory storage means(40) divided into a plurality of blocks

Art Unit: 2674

wherein each block corresponds to an image block displayed on a display unit(30) is old(column 6, lines 9-67 and figure 5).

As to claims 3-6, 10-13 and 17-18, relative to the limitations "division of storage into areas respectively corresponding to a plurality of storage chambers in the refrigerator or deletion of a selected image data", it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to apply the above noted teaching of Omori to the modified system of Bridson such that to divide the storage means(25,28) into areas and in each area storing image data on the stored items/foods respectively corresponding to a plurality of item/food chambers provided in the refrigerator because Omori shows the broad concept of dividing a storage means into areas corresponding to divided display areas and further because storage, deletion or display of any kind of image data is a matter of a design choice which would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.

4. Claims 9 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bridson and Norwood as applied to claims 7 and 21 above, and further in view of McGill et al(Us 20020016734A1).

Bridson and Norwood are discussed above. McGill et al is cited to show that concept of utilizing a calendar and schedule function having a repetition cycle feature in an integrated household management system is old(paragraphs 42-55). Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to apply the noted teaching of McGill et al to the modified system of Bridson such that to provide a repetition cycle

Art Unit: 2674

feature so that a designated event would happen on a daily, weekly, monthly or yearly basis because Bridson also use a calendar and schedule function in his system and further because the repetition cycle reminder is a standard feature in any calendar and scheduling management devices. As to the limitation "determining whether a date on a schedule depends on a solar calendar or a lunar calendar", such is a matter of design choice because a lunar calendar or a solar calendar is still a calendar and it is a matter of software designation to specify the type of the calendar which is a simple design choice which would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-30 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Jenson et al is made of record to show a method and apparatus for controlling a scheduler.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Mike Fatahiyar** whose telephone number is **(703) 305-6911**.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **Richard Hjerpe**, can be reached at **(703) 305-4709**.

Art Unit: 2674

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:


(703) 872-9314 (for Technology Center 2600 only)

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Technology Center 2600 Customer Service Office whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377.

MF
M. Fatahiyar

May 16, 2004


5/17/04
RICHARD HJERPE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600